

REMARKS

Claim 3 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 6, and claim 6 has been canceled accordingly. Since the Examiner has in essence considered the subject matter of amended claim 3 by virtue of having previously considered claim 6, entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 3-5

On page 3 of the Office Action, in paragraph 8, claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2002-319686 to Shimakawa et al. Further, on page 5 of the Office Action, in paragraph 9, claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 10-200142 A to Toyoda et al.

In response, and to advance the prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 3 to incorporate the recitations of claim 6, which has not been included in these rejections. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these rejections have been overcome, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claim 6

On page 7 of the Office Action, in paragraph 10, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 2002-319686 to Shimakawa et al. Also, on page 8 of the Office Action, in paragraph 11, claim 6 is

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 10-200142 A to Toyoda et al.

In response, Applicants note initially that the Examiner is relying on conventional methods disclosed in the cited references (see, e.g., the last two sentences on page 9 in the Office Action), rather than on the disclosure concerning the invention of those references.

Further, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the conventional methods to arrive at the claimed invention, because one would have thought that the modified conventional methods would have still had the problems described in the cited references (e.g., connection problems, as discussed in paragraph [0007] in Shimakawa and paragraph [0008] in Toyoda), and one would not have wanted such problems.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 3 to incorporate the recitations of claim 6, since the Examiner has indicated that the conventional methods do not actually include the features of claim 6 (since the Examiner has rejected claim 6 for obviousness rather than anticipation).

Thus, Applicants submit that one would not have modified the conventional methods disclosed in the cited references to arrive at amended claim 3, such that claim 3 and the claims dependent thereon are not obvious over the cited art. Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No.: 10/584,286

Attorney Docket No.: Q95660

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 1, 2010